



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,019	04/05/2001	Jeffrey McCaskey	88835.022400	4834

7590 05/18/2005

Thomas R. FitzGerald, Esq.  
JAECKLE FLEICHMANN & MUGEL, LLP  
39 State Street  
Rochester, NY 14614-1310

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/827,019	MCCASKEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-23 and 25-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-23 and 25-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*[Handwritten signature]*

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: request for continued examination, filed 18 March 2005, to the original application filed 5 April 2001.
2. The previous rejection of claims 1-67 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
3. Claims 1-10, 12-23, and 25-70 are pending. Claims 11 and 24 have been cancelled. Claims 68-70 are new claims. Claims 1, 3, and 51 are independent claims.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-15, 25-34, 44-45, 47-48, and 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836).

As per claim 1, Ferrel discloses an apparatus for translating and recomposing text from news print publication electronic files to a form displayable on the World Wide Web (See Ferrel, Column 7, lines 5-9, Column 3, lines 47-67, and Column 35, lines 22-32) including a server computer system, including one or more interconnected computer

Art Unit: 2176

processors each with its own memory and secondary storage, for storing, converting, organizing and displaying news information on the World Wide Web (See Ferrel, Figure 2, and Column 10, lines 17-33), including means for receiving a number of news print publication electronic files including news story text data and news story image data (See Ferrel, Figure 3, Column 4, lines 16-25, and Column 8, lines 62-64). This system includes publication storage, equivalent to an editorial database, which stores information extracted from print publication electronic files. This system also includes a means for extracting text information from the print publication electronic files, located on the publisher workstations, and converting and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2). This system also includes a publishing program for extracting news stories from the publication storage, converting them into Web pages, and storing the Web pages in a set of newspaper story text files capable of being displayed at a news Website on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 41-67, and Column 12, lines 1-5). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a news story filter program for extraction of text information from the news print publication electronic files, converting the text information into a database format, and storing the text information in the editorial database as filtered news stories. Sumita discloses a filtering apparatus for receiving articles from various sources including a means to determine the relevance of the articles based on a predetermined criteria (See Sumita, Column 3, lines 5-18, Column 23, lines 32-67, and Figures 21, 23, 30, and 31). Ferrel and Sumita are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the filtered news stories of Sumita with the apparatus for translating, recomposing and storing news print publication electronic files of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an information filtering apparatus capable of giving a presentation of the relevance of articles to be supplied to a user (See Sumita, Column 2, lines 29-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sumita with Ferrel for the benefit of providing an information filtering apparatus capable of giving a presentation of the relevance of articles to be supplied to a user to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per claim 2, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a plurality of templates used to organize the display of the news text files and edited news files on the Web. (See Ferrel, Column 15, lines 55-59). Ferrel also teaches a set of news Web pages that can be displayed on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 6, and Column 17, lines 18-30).

As per claim 12, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that each template contains a number of lists of links to other news stories and news Web pages. (See Ferrel, Figure 7).

As per claim 13, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the list of links contains a link to each section of the news. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, and Column 18, lines 7-10).

As per claim 14, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the list of links contains a link to each topic of the news in a single section of the news. (See Figure 7).

As per claim 15, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the templates comprise one or more templates consisting of a topic Web page template for presenting a number of news stories related to that topic, which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 15. In the example shown by Ferrel, the Business section is presented. (See Ferrel, Figure 8, and Column 19, lines 40-52).

As per claim 3, Ferrel discloses an apparatus for translating and recomposing electronic news text from news print publication electronic files to a form displayable on the World Wide Web including a server computer system, including one or more interconnected computer processors each with its own memory and secondary storage, for storing, converting, organizing and displaying news information on the World Wide Web (See Ferrel, Column 7, lines 5-9, Column 3, lines 47-67, and Column 35, lines 23-32). This apparatus includes publication storage, equivalent to an editorial database, which stores information extracted from print publication electronic files. This system also includes a means for extracting text information from the news print publication electronic, converting the text information into a database format, and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2). This apparatus also includes a news story publishing program for extracting text information from the editorial database, converting the text information into a form

Art Unit: 2176

suitable for display on the World Wide Web, and storing the text information in a set of news text files capable of display at a news Website on the World Wide Web (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 41-67, and Column 12, lines 1-5). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a news story filter program for extraction of text information from the news print publication electronic files while preserving some tags in the news print publication electronic files, converting the text information and preserved tags into a database format, and storing the text information and preserved tags in the editorial database. Sumita discloses a filtering apparatus for receiving articles from various sources including a means to determine the relevance of the articles based on a predetermined criteria (See Sumita, Column 3, lines 5-18, Column 23, lines 32-67, and Figures 21, 23, 30, and 31). Note that Applicant defines tags as "a series of identifiably-marked data fields containing classification and other descriptive information concerning the story" (See Application, Page 7, lines 18-19). Sumita also discloses storing the information source, date of article, frequency information, etc, for the news print publication electronic files, equivalent to tags (See Sumita, Column 16, lines 40-67, Column 17, lines 1-4, and Figure 5, element S14). Ferrel and Sumita are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the filtered news stories and preservation of tag information of Sumita with the apparatus for translating, recomposing and storing news print publication electronic files of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an information filtering apparatus capable of giving a presentation of the relevance of

articles to be supplied to a user (See Sumita, Column 2, lines 29-33) and to store indexing information for each article (See Sumita, Column 17, lines 2-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sumita with Ferrel for the benefit of providing an information filtering apparatus capable of giving a presentation of the relevance of articles to be supplied to a user and for the benefit of storing indexing information for each article to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

As per claim 4, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the print publication electronic files comprise data files which contain stories or pictures (See Ferrel, Column 8, lines 62-64), which are included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 4.

As per claim 6, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a news image conversion program, incorporated in the Designer Component, which extracts image information from the news print publication electronic files, converts the image information into files in a common image format, and stores news print publication electronic files information in an electronic news image library. (See Ferrel, Column 10, lines 34-47, Column 23, lines 49-64, and Figure 10, element 565).

As per claim 10, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a means of drafting and editing the contents of the publication storage, associating the text data with image files and initiating the text extraction and publication programs. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 7-15, Figure 5, and Column 23, lines 51-57).



As per claim 25, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the text data files contain news story data, formatting information, in the form of tags, which define the appearance of the data, and descriptive information defining the content of the data, in the form of a find properties object stream. (See Ferrel, Column 4, lines 16-32, and Figure 14).

As per claim 26, Ferrel and Sumita discloses the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the formatting information is stored in the form of codes (i.e. tags) of a text markup language. (See Ferrel, Figure 14).

As per claim 27, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Ferrel also shows tags for a markup language that are defined as HTML tags. (See Ferrel, figure 14, and Column 32, lines 5-16. The tags shown by Ferrel are MPML tags. MPML is a version of HTML 2.0 – See Ferrel, Column 3, line 65).

As per claim 28, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the descriptive information is stored in the form of codes (i.e. tags) of a text markup language. (See Ferrel, Column 31, lines 59-67, and Column 23, lines 1-4).

As per claim 29, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the markup language used is MPML, which is a version of HTML 2.0 – See Ferrel, Column 3, line 65).

As per claim 30, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the descriptive information is stored in the form of keywords in the text of the news story. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 48-52).

As per claim 31, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages comprise text files. (See Ferrel, Column 4, lines 16-20).

As per claim 32, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the text files contain information that can be updated or modified when the file is displayed. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41).

As per claim 33, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a number of templates for organizing the display of the newspaper story text files on the World Wide Web, a set of news Web pages capable of display on the World Wide Web, and where the news Web pages comprise image files. (See Ferrel, Column 8, lines 2-4, and Figure 8).

As per claim 34, Ferrel and Sumita discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that this system consists of a separate conversion computer, with its own main and secondary memory as is inherently true in the art, used to organize the text data files into news Web pages, and a Web server, also with its own main and secondary memory as is inherently true in the art, used to retrieve, update, and display the news Web pages for a reader. (See Ferrel, figure 3, Column 12, lines 27-67, and Column 13, lines 1-36).

As per claim 44, Ferrel and Sumita discloses the limitations of claim 34 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the templates contain code executable only on the server(s). (See Ferrel, Figure 11, and Column 24, lines 16-62).

As per claim 45, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that each template includes embedded directives for substitution of template content with the contents of other files which contain story data. (See Ferrel, Column 18, lines 33-42, and Figure 8).

As per claim 47, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the publisher, as shown in Ferrel, Figure 1, releases the project which contains the formatted story text. This makes the project files available on the network. (See Ferrel, Column 16, lines 49-57).

As per claim 48, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Ferrel also discloses the use of a Project Editor program and Designer program to create a story Web page with embedded story text and images in a story Web page template, a main Web page template, a section Web page template and a topic Web page template. (See Ferrel, Column 17, lines 50-67, Column 18, lines 1-13, Figure 7 and Figure 8).

As per claim 67-68, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Sumita also discloses that the filter program extracts text information periodically (See Sumita, Column 14, lines 63-67, and Column 15, lines 1-2), and that the Web pages to be archived are selected on the basis of the filtered news story's latest display date. Ferrel and Sumita are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the periodic extraction of text information and archiving of Web pages based on the latest display date of the filtered news story of Sumita with the apparatus for translating and recomposing text from news print publication electronic files of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to permit the retrieving conditions and the threshold of similarities to be dynamically changed so as to always present appropriate articles to a user (See Sumita, Column 2, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sumita with Ferrel for the benefit of permitting the retrieving conditions and the threshold of similarities to be dynamically changed so as to always present appropriate articles to a user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 67 and 68.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1).

As per claim 7, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a content editor to edit information contained in the text files. (See Ferrel, Figure 12). Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly a classified advertisement database containing classified advertisement information, a classified notices program for editing text classified advertisement information, or a classified notices maintenance program for updating edited classified advertisement information. Kovack discloses a method for generating an electronic newspaper that includes a

predefined page information database for a classified advertisement page. (See Kovack, Page 1, paragraph 0007, lines 16-23, Page 2, paragraph 0025, lines 1-2, and Page 4, claim 1). Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined page information database for a classified advertisement page of Kovack with the content editing program of Ferrel and Sumita. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method to easily update information contained in the electronic publication that might require changes without having to update the page layout. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kovack with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of editing classified advertisements in an electronic publication to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

As per claim 8, Ferrel and Sumita discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a content editor to edit information contained in the text files. (See Ferrel, Figure 12). Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly a death notices database containing death notice information or a death notices program for editing text death notice information. Kovack discloses a method for generating an electronic newspaper that includes a predefined page information database for an obituary page. (See Kovack, Page 1, paragraph 0007, lines 16-23, Page 2, paragraph 0025, lines 1-2, and Page 4, claim 1). Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information

electronically via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined page information database for an obituary page of Kovack with the content editing program of Ferrel and Sumita. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method to easily update information contained in the electronic publication that might require changes without having to update the page layout. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kovack with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of editing obituary information in an electronic publication to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claims 7 and 8.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Riley (U.S. Patent 1,090,346).

As per claim 16, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of baseball box scores, top news stories of one section of the news, the relative team standings of a plurality of baseball leagues, football box scores, or the relative team standings of a plurality of football leagues. Riley discloses a method of presenting tabulated baseball score results in a form useful for publishing, which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 16. (See Riley, page 1, Column 1, lines 40-43, and figure 1). Ferrel, Sumita

Art Unit: 2176

and Riley are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying sports scores in a printed media. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel and Sumita with the baseball box scores of Riley. The motivation for doing so would have been to present the baseball scoring results in a concise manner suitable for a limited amount of space. (See Riley, page 1, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Riley with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of condensing baseball score information to be presented in a published media to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Publication 2001/0047373 A1).

As per claim 17, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of a bridal Web page template, an entertainment Web page template, a movie reviews Web page template, a cartoon Web page template, or a travel Web page template. Jones discloses the inclusion of cartoons in an online information display system. (See Jones, page 7, paragraph 0070). Ferrel, Sumita and Jones are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information in an electronic format. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine

the page templates of Ferrel and Sumita with the cartoon images of Jones. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the reader of an electronic publication with the cartoon images in a layout that allows them to view both the image and any associated text simultaneously (See Jones, page 1, paragraph 0010, and page 7, paragraph 0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jones with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of enhanced viewing of text and image data in an electronic format to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,301,574 B1).

As per claim 18, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of an archival Web page for presenting an entry allowing a reader to search the news story archive. Thomas discloses a system for providing information, applicable to an online newspaper application, which can be used in conjunction with a searching device to conduct searches of online news archives. (See Thomas, Column 10, lines 32-38). Ferrel, Sumita and Thomas are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing useful information in an electronic format. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel and Sumita with the archival search of Thomas. The motivation for doing so would



have been to provide a reader with the means to search for information from a large source of data to find specific topics of interest to the reader. (See Thomas, Column 10, lines 41-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomas with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of providing a means of searching a large amount of news archival data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Claims 19, 21-23 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 19 and 22, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly that the editorial database, or publication storage, resides on a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Sumita and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data storage system of Ferrel and Sumita with the relational

database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claims 19 and 22.

As per claim 21, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly a set of maintenance subprograms for updating information stored in the editorial database. Dabney discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Dabney also discloses that this data is maintained and edited by a plurality of content servers (See Dabney, Figure 3B, and Column 7, lines 3-4). The content server allows editors to electronically update the data. (See Dabney, Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-33 and Figure 11). Ferrel, Sumita and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the means for editing the contents of the editorial database of Ferrel and Sumita with the content server programs of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of an interface that would enable an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

As per claim 23, Ferrel, Sumita and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the files, or titles, are contained in folders that are related by content. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 58-67).

As per claim 49, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a story finding maintenance Web page providing a list of headlines for a given day allowing a proofreader the ability to create a link to a specific story in the database. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, Column 17, lines 50-67, and Column 18, lines 1-14). Ferrel also discloses a headline maintenance Web page which would enable a proofreader or editor to place stories on a section Web page in order of importance. (See Ferrel, Column 27, lines 56-67, Column 28, lines 1-3, and Figure 12, element 690). Ferrel also discloses a means for changing the published status of stories in the editorial database to permit their republication on the news Website. This is done using the "find properties" which include important information about the document. (See Ferrel, Figure 12, and Column 28, lines 14-40). Ferrel also discloses a means which would enable a proofreader to associate images with a specific story in the editorial database. (See Ferrel, Column 15, lines 55-67, and Column 16, lines 1-2, lines 11-21). Ferrel also discloses a means to edit a story thus enabling a proofreader or editor to update all information for a story in the editorial database or publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 7-15, Figure 5, and Column 23, lines 51-57). Ferrel also discloses a means to search for a story, using a search object, which would

Art Unit: 2176

enable a proofreader to search for stories in the editorial database. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 48-51). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a means to enable a proofreader or editor to place a story on the website by updating records within the database table structure. Dabney discloses that an editor can update data within the database to alter the story content. See Dabney, Figure 6, Column 10, lines 23-37, and Column 12, lines 8-24). Ferrel, Sumita, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the editorial maintenance program of Ferrel and Sumita with the means of updating database content of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 49.

As per claim 50, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a means for a proofreader or editor to correct key properties of a particular story. Also incorporated into this functionality is the ability to add pertinent properties for each story as determined by a user. Such properties could include author, keywords, town, kicker assignment, and kicker topic. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 41-67, Column 23, lines 1-5, and Figure 12). Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly a means to add, change or eliminate a particular field in the editorial database or publication storage, such as the topic ID, a means to append a story to the

Art Unit: 2176

end of another story, or a means to replicate a story in the database. Dabney discloses that an editor can update data within the database to alter the story content or location. See Dabney, Figure 6, Column 10, lines 23-37, Column 12, lines 8-24, and Figure 9, element 940). All data in the database can be edited by the means disclosed by Dabney, which includes story content, appending story data from one location to another, and replicating story data from one location to another. (See Dabney, Figure 10, elements 1080 through 1075). Ferrel, Sumita and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the editorial maintenance program of Ferrel and Sumita with the means of updating database content of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) and Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162).

As per claim 20, Ferrel, Sumita and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ferrel also discloses news story text and classification content

(See Ferrel, Figure 6), news topic information and news topic classifications (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 402), news section information and news section classifications (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 412), news story source information (See Ferrel, Figure 6, elements 382 and 386, where the source of the news stories listed is shown to be "Reuter"), news story linkage information (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 422). Ferrel, Sumita and Dabney do not disclose expressly that the relational database contains geographic classification information. Smith discloses a document management system that contains geographic classification, or zone, information (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Smith also discloses the inclusion of news image caption information, which is presented in the form of headlines and associated photographs (See Smith, Column 16, lines 44-47). Ferrel, Sumita, Dabney and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting news data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the specific data content information of Ferrel, Sumita and Smith with the relational database structure of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Also, the motivation for including the geographic data and image caption data of Smith would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content for specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for varying display of specific data relating text to images. (See Smith, Column 16, lines 49-59). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to combine Smith, Dabney, Sumita and Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating, storage and distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Claims 35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) and Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) as applied to claims 7, 8, and 9 above, and further in view of Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 35, Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack disclose the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack do not disclose expressly that the publication storage resides on a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the classified advertisements data storage system of Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the

Art Unit: 2176

data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 35.

As per claim 37, Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack disclose the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack do not disclose expressly that the death notices database is a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the death notices data of Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel, Sumita and Kovack for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.



As per claim 38, Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 37 as described above. By definition, the relational database disclosed in claim 37 contains data in the form of tables. (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables") It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to define a table or set of tables to contain death notice information. The motivation for doing so would have been to separate the death notice information in a relational structure which would provide for easy and efficient data updating and maintenance. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a separate death notices table as a part of the relational database of claim 37 for the benefit of improved data maintenance to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Claim 39 is rejected on the same basis as claims 35 and 37.

Claims 36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836), Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) and Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1), as applied to claims 35 and 39 above, and further in view of Reuning (U.S. Patent 6,381,592 B1).

As per claim 36, Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack and Dabney disclose the limitations of claims 7 and 35 above. Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack and Dabney do not disclose expressly the inclusion of help wanted or help wanted keyword data. Reuning discloses the

Art Unit: 2176

inclusion of help wanted data and keyword input upon which to search the data (See Reuning, Column 1, lines 14-18, and Column 3, lines 10-22). Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack, Dabney and Reuning are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the help wanted data content and keyword information of Reuning with the relational database structure of Ferrel, Sumita, Kovack, and Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Also the motivation for including the help wanted data and keyword information of Reuning would have been to provide for more efficient job searching techniques using online data (See Reuning, Column 1, lines 18-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reuning, Kovack, Dabney, Sumita and Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating, storage and distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

Claim 40 is rejected on the same basis as claims 36 and 38.

Claims 5 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836), as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1).

As per claim 5, Ferrel and Sumita discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly an electronic news subscriber database for storing electronic mail addresses and information preferences

Art Unit: 2176

of electronic news subscribers. Walker discloses a method for readers of newspapers, or similar printed media to obtain supplemental information, or portions of information, in the articles. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 46-54). Walker also discloses that this information is distributed to subscribers using electronic mail. The electronic mail addresses and preferences of the subscribers are stored in a subscriber database. (See Walker, Column 8, lines 66-67, and Column 9, lines 1-24). Ferrel, Sumita and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber database of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Sumita. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

As per claim 41, Ferrel, Sumita and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Walker also discloses that the subscriber database is a relational database. (See Walker, Column 7, lines 52-54). Ferrel, Sumita and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the relational subscriber database of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Sumita. The motivation for

Art Unit: 2176

doing so would have been to provide readers with rapid responses to requests for supplemental information. (See Walker, Column 7, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of providing timely responses for information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 41.

As per claim 42, Ferrel, Sumita and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 41 as described above. Walker also discloses that the relational subscriber database has a table of subscriber information. (See Walker, Figure 3d). Ferrel, Sumita and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber information table of Walker with the electronic news publication system utilizing a relational subscriber database, as disclosed by Ferrel, Sumita and Walker. The motivation for doing so would have been to store subscriber data necessary to effect the dissemination of information requested by a subscriber. (See Walker, Column 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of storing subscriber data needed to distribute requested information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 42.

As per claim 43, Ferrel, Sumita and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Walker also discloses that the subscriber or user database contains files, or records, that contain data related by virtue of their content. (See Walker, Figure 3d). Ferrel, Sumita and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field

of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the related records contained in the subscriber information table of Walker with the electronic news publication system utilizing a relational subscriber database, as disclosed by Ferrel, Sumita and Walker. The motivation for doing so would have been to store subscriber data necessary to effect the dissemination of information requested by a subscriber. (See Walker, Column 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of storing subscriber data needed to distribute requested information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 43.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Weeks (WO 98/470083).

As per claim 46, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a set of containers, containing multiple projects of files, which can be used to categorize data files according to the needs of the user. Ferrel discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification based on multiple data elements or related subject matter in a story. (See Ferrel, Column 14, lines 2-5). Ferrel also discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's classification by using the story's kicker to determine a topic associated with the kicker in the database. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 52-56). Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly that the containers could be used to determine a

Art Unit: 2176

story's topic classification using the story's town to determine a topic associated with the town in the database, or by using a weighted count of keywords found to select the topic associated in the database. Smith discloses the use of zones, or geographic locations which includes towns, to determine a publication's circulation area. (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Weeks discloses ranking words within a text to determine the key terms based on a weighted average of occurrences. (See Weeks, page 2, lines 12-13, and page 5, lines 10-16). Ferrel, Sumita, Smith and Weeks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data filtering of Ferrel and Sumita with the geographic classification of Smith and the calculated keyword occurrence of Weeks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content classified by specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for improved story classifications based on main topics, thus allowing the reader to find a topic of interest by entering a keyword (See Weeks, page 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ferrel, Sumita, Smith and Weeks for the benefit of improved data distribution within the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 46.

Claims 69-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836), as applied

to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Gorelick (U.S. Publication 2002/0107882 A1).

As per claims 69 and 70, Ferrel and Sumita disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 2 as described above. Ferrel and Sumita do not disclose expressly providing Web page redirect instructions to allow a reader to be redirected to an outside source for Web pages that have been archived. Gorelick discloses adding a hyperlink to direct a user to a particular website (See Gorelick, Page 6, Claim 8). Ferrel, Sumita and Gorelick are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the redirecting of a user to a particular hyperlink of Gorelick with the page templates of Ferrel and Sumita. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to connect to other pages on the same website or other websites (See Gorelick, Page 3, paragraph 0028). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gorelick with Ferrel and Sumita for the benefit of allowing users to connect to other pages on the same website or other websites to obtain the invention as specified in claims 69 and 70.

Claims 51-52, 54, 56-58, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923).

As per claim 51, Ferrel discloses a method for automatically translating and recomposing news text and images from news print publication electronic files to a form

Art Unit: 2176

displayable on the World Wide Web including extracting raw story from the news print publication electronic files (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 41-67, and Column 12, lines 1-5), converting the raw story text from the news print publication electronic files into an editorial database format (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2), and storing the converted raw story text in the raw story text as converted story text files in an editorial database (See Ferrel, Column 31, lines 59-67, Column 32, lines 1-4, and Figure 14). Ferrel also discloses organizing and storing the extracted story information and image files on a news Website in a set of news Web pages suitable for display and reading on the World Wide Web (See Ferrel Figure 6, and Column 17, lines 18-65). Ferrel does not disclose expressly extracting and storing classification and tags, extracting image information, converting the image information, and storing the converted image information, extracting the converted story text and images. Shibata discloses extracting classification information (See Shibata, Column 14, lines 27-33) and at least one tag in the raw story text (See Shibata, Column 14, lines 66-67, Column 15, lines 1-18, and Figure 6), extracting image information (See Shibata, Column 13, lines 52-67), converting the image information into a common image format (See Shibata, Column 13, lines 9-18),, and storing the converted image information as image files in a news image library (See Shibata, Column 14, lines 2-3, and Column 13, lines 61-67), and extracting the converted story text and images, organizing and storing the extracted story information and image files on a news Website in a set of news Web pages (See Shibata, Column 4, lines 65-67, and Column 5, lines 1-8). Ferrel and Shibata are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of



providing news information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the classification information, tags and images of Shibata with the news print publication electronic files of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to produce an electronic publication converting paper-based publications to electronic publications that provides better viewability, acquirability, portability and cost effectiveness than the paper-based publications (See Shibata, Column 2, lines 53-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shibata with Ferrel for the benefit of producing an electronic publication converting paper-based publications to electronic publications that provides better viewability, acquirability, portability and cost effectiveness than paper-based publications to obtain the invention as specified in claim 51.

As per claim 52, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a method for extracting text information from the news print publication electronic files, located on the publisher workstations, and converting and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2).

As per claim 54, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses the step of proofing the set of news Web pages to change their appearance and organization. (See Ferrel, Column 16, lines 9-21).

As per claim 56, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses extracting, converting and storing story text information, providing a means for a proofreader to initiate a process for editorial

database retrieval, conversion and formatting of the converted story text files and the image for display on the World Wide Web, and providing a means for a proofreader to direct the converted raw story text files and the image files that have been retrieved, converted and formatted for display on the Web to a local caching object store which serves as a test news Website before publication of the Web page. (See Ferrel, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Column 24, lines 37-62).

As per claim 57, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses retrieving the Web page template files defining the form and interconnections of Web pages, and executing Web page template commands to replace the template directives with specific news text file electronic contents retrieved from the converted story text files from the publication storage database. (See Ferrel, Figure 1, Column 9, lines 9-41, Column 10, lines 34-47, Column 23, lines 58-64, and Figure 4).

As per claim 58, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses executing program code in the set of news Web pages to store current server information in the set of news Web pages. (See Ferrel, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Column 25, lines 21-51).

As per claim 63, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news information is published to a server that can be connected to the Internet, thus providing the news Web pages on a daily basis to the World Wide Web for presentation to Web users. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 26-37, and Column 24, lines 58-62).

As per claim 64, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages can be delivered to the World Wide Web for presentation to Web users on the basis of changes in news information. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 26-53).

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923), as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Weeks (WO 98/470083) and Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162).

As per claim 53, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a set of containers, containing multiple projects of files, which can be used to categorize data files according to the needs of the user. Ferrel discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification based on multiple data elements or related subject matter in a story. (See Ferrel, Column 14, lines 2-5). Ferrel also discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's classification by using the story's kicker to determine a topic associated with the kicker in the database. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 52-56). Ferrel and Shibata do not disclose expressly that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification using the story's town to determine a topic associated with the town in the database, or by using a weighted count of keywords found to select the topic associated in the database. Smith discloses the use of zones, or geographic locations which includes towns, to determine a publication's circulation area. (See Smith, Column

Art Unit: 2176

9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Weeks discloses ranking words within a text to determine the key terms based on a weighted average of occurrences. (See Weeks, page 2, lines 12-13, and page 5, lines 10-16). Ferrel, Shibata, Smith and Weeks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data filtering of Ferrel and Shibata with the geographic classification of Smith and the calculated keyword occurrence of Weeks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content classified by specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for improved story classifications based on main topics, thus allowing the reader to find a topic of interest by entering a keyword (See Weeks, page 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ferrel, Shibata, Smith and Weeks for the benefit of improved data distribution within the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 53.

Claims 55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923), as applied to claims 51 and 54 above, and further in view of Dabney (6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 55, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 54 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that news text electronic data files are associated with available image electronic data files. (See Ferrel, Column 23, lines 58-67, and Column 24, lines 1-10). Ferrel and Shibata do not disclose expressly that the

proofing step can consist of adding, changing or deleting records in the editorial database. Dabney also discloses that data stored in a relational database is maintained and edited by a plurality of content servers (See Dabney, Figure 3B, and Column 7, lines 3-4). The content server allows editors to electronically update the data. (See Dabney, Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-33 and Figure 11). It is inherently true that a relational database structure incorporates the ability to add, change, delete, reorganize and associate records within the database. Ferrel, Shibata and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proofing method of Ferrel and Shibata with the content server programs of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of an interface that would enable an editor or proofreader to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Shibata for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 55.

As per claim 59, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses an archiving program using containers for multiple projects. This program allows for the extraction, conversion, and storage of the news print publication electronic files. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 38-51, and figure 4). Ferrel and Shibata do not disclose expressly that the text information is stored in an electronic news archive. Dabney discloses a content management system in which

Art Unit: 2176

news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Since news information is collected and stored electronically on the relational database as disclosed by Dabney, this database serves as an electronic news archive. It is also inherently true that a relational database structure allows for the addition, modification, and deletion or removal of data. Ferrel, Shibata and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the news text and image translation and composition apparatus of Ferrel and Shibata with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Shibata for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 59.

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923), as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Milewski (U.S. Patent 6,289,346 B1).

As per claim 60, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 59 as described above. Ferrel and Shibata do not disclose expressly marking as archived all converted story text files from which the archived news Web pages were derived. Milewski discloses marking an archived news programs (See Milewski, Column 3, lines

Art Unit: 2176

37-47. Ferrel, Shibata and Milewski are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the marking of an archived news program of Milewski with the method of Ferrel and Shibata. The motivation for doing so would have been to properly identify the program or information of interest of the user (See Milewski, Column 3, lines 64-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Milewski with Ferrel and Shibata for the benefit of properly identifying the program or information of interest of the user to obtain the invention as specified in claim 60.

Claims 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923), as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1).

As per claim 61, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel and Shibata do not disclose expressly the step of selecting and sending a set of news Web pages to news subscribers via electronic mail. Walker discloses that news Web pages are sent to subscribers by a delivery means as specified by the subscriber. (See Walker, Column 11, lines 43-51). Walker also discloses that the delivery means can be electronic mail. (See Walker, Figure 3D, element 292). Ferrel, Shibata and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber

news delivery method of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Shibata. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Shibata for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 61.

As per claim 62, Ferrel, Shibata and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 61 as described above. Walker also discloses a means for a number of subscribers to request electronic mail presentation of news information. (See Walker, Figure 3D, elements 281 and 292). Walker also discloses a means for a subscriber to specify his or her selection criteria for news topics to be delivered. (See Walker, Figure 5a and Column 9, lines 48-59). Walker also discloses a means for extracting the news information from the set of news Web pages according to criteria selected by the subscriber. (See Walker, Figure 4, element 410, and Column 9, lines 32-47). Walker also discloses that a mail message is prepared and transmitted to each subscriber requesting electronic mail presentation of news information. (See Walker, Figure 7, and Column 11, lines 37-51). Ferrel, Shibata and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber news delivery service of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Shibata. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information



electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Shibata for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 62.

Claims 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Shibata (U.S. Patent 5,835,923), as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Vaithyanathan (U.S. Patent 5,857,179).

As per claims 65-66, Ferrel and Shibata disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel and Shibata do not disclose expressly comparing keywords in a story being extracted to the keywords of at least two of the stories in the editorial database, calculating a value based on each comparison, assigning a weight for each keyword, and assigning as the topic to the story being extracted the topic of the story in the editorial database associated with the highest value calculated. Vaithyanathan discloses comparing keywords of a document to keywords in a cluster of documents (See Vaithyanathan, Claim 10), calculating a value based on the comparison (See Vaithyanathan, Column 5, lines 56-67, and Column 6, lines 1-30), categorizing a document based on the highest values calculated (See Vaithyanathan, Claim 12), and assigning a weight for each keyword (See Vaithyanathan, Claim 13, Column 5, lines 56-67, and Column 6, lines 1-30). Ferrel, Shibata and Vaithyanathan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 2176

ordinary skill in the art to include the comparison, calculation of values based on the comparison, and categorization of documents based on the calculation of Vaithyanathan with the news story data and publication storage database of Ferrel and Shibata. The motivation for doing so would have been to categorize the stories in a time-efficient manner in order to provide for information filtering (See Vaithyanathan, Column 2, lines 20-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vaithyanathan with Ferrel and Shibata for the benefit of categorizing the stories to enhance the filtering of information to obtain the invention as specified in claims 65-66.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Leonard (U.S. Publication 2002/0120629 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for information delivery on computer networks.
- Allan discloses on-line new event detection and tracking.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sanjiv Shah', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**